22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	Case 2:06-cv-01176-LRH-LRL Document	37 Filed 09/11/08	Page 1 of 2	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DI	STRICT COURT		
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
10				
11	EILEEN LANAHAN,	Case No.: 2:06-cv-	-1176-LRH-RJJ	
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER	
13	vs.	STIPULATION A FOR EXTENSIO	N FOR	
14	SOUTHERN NEVADA HEALTH)	<u>DEFENDANT TO</u> PLAINTIFF'S O	O FILE REPLY TO PPOSITION TO	
15	DISTRICT, fka Clark County Health District,	MOTION FOR S		
16	Defendant.	(Second Request)		
17				
18	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by th	e parties, by and thro	ugh their respective	
19	counsel of record, that Defendant, SOUTHE	counsel of record, that Defendant, SOUTHERN NEVADA HEALTH DISTRICT, be		
20	granted an extension of five days, up to and including September 15, 2008, within			

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by the parties, by and through their respective counsel of record, that Defendant, SOUTHERN NEVADA HEALTH DISTRICT, be granted an extension of five days, up to and including September 15, 2008, within which to file its Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment ("Plaintiff's Opposition"). Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment was filed on July 9, 2008. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Opposition was originally due on July 28, 2008. On August 4, 2008, the above-referenced Court granted Plaintiff its first extension of time within which to file her Opposition. Again, on August 13, 2008, the honorable Court granted a second extension of time to Plaintiff to file her Opposition. Under said Order, Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition was due on or before September 2, 2008.

Case 2:06-cv-01176-LRH-LRL Document 37 Filed 09/11/08 Page 2 of 2

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26

27

28

1

2

The granting of Plaintiff's requests for extensions pushed the Reply deadline to
a time when Defendant's counsel has been involved in extensive collective bargaining
negotiations, arbitration hearings, and other events on behalf of other clients and
therefore, he has been unable to complete the Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition
Therefore, on September 2, 2008, Defendant requested a one-week extension of time to
file its Reply. Since then, though Defendant's counsel has been working diligently or
finalizing the Reply, additional responsibilities, including a teacher termination
hearing, has made it difficult to complete the document as anticipated. Additionally
the time is necessary so as to allow the District appropriate time to review the Reply
prior to filing.

This is Defendant's second request for an extension in this matter and is made in good faith and not for any reason of delay. Indeed, the time sought is only five days, and the District will be seeking no further extensions of this deadline.

Therefore, it is request that the Court grant Defendant up to and including September 15, 2008, within which to file its Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition.

DATED this 10th day of September, DATED this 10th day of September, 2008

2008

FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP

/s/ Kichard Segerbiom
RICHARD SEGERBLOM, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No.: 1010
704 South Ninth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Attorney for Plaintiff
•

/a/ Dialaged Cassellane

By /s/ Shaun P. Haley Shaun P. Haley, Esq. Nevada Bar No.: 7000 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite. 650 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Attorneys for Defendant

IT IS SO ORDERED this 11th day of September, 2008.

LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE